

REMARKS

Claims 2-5, 9, 10 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Schellenberg, U.S. Patent No. 4,742,935.

The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

As now claimed, the Applicant's invention is directed to a blister pack for receiving and containing an article to be packaged. The blister pack includes a front part having a recessed portion and a back part having a relieved portion adapted for an insertion into the recessed portion of the front part for closure of the pack. Cooperating locating means on the front and back parts respectively, maintain the pack in a closed position. The locating means include an abutment on the inner wall surface of the recessed portion of the front part and a cooperating abutment on the outer wall surface of the relieved portion of the back part. The inner and outer wall abutments are located thereon such that they become inter-engaged to close the pack, such that at least a substantial majority of the back part is wholly contained in the recessed portion of the front part. The abutment on the inner wall surface of the recessed portion of the front part extends inwards from the wall surface to at least as great an extent as that by which the abutment of the relieved portion of the back part comprising a continuous narrow flange protruding outwardly from the relieved portion and forming an outmost edge of the back part within the recessed portion of the front part when the back is closed such that none of the back part extends outwardly of the abutment of the relieved portion of the front part of the pack when the pack is closed.

On the other hand, Shellenberg'935 is directed to a blister pack having a front part having a recessed portion and a back part. However, Shellenberg does include at least a

substantial majority of the back part being wholly contained in the recessed portion of the front part. Thus, the Applicant's invention is not anticipated by Schellenberg'935.

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schellenberg'935. As claim 8 is dependent upon a now patentable independent claim, the Applicant requests that the Examiner's rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the amended claims and the claims dependent there from are in proper form. Thus, claims 2-10 and 12 should be considered patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record and in proper form.

The application is now considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Arlene J. Powers  
Registration No. 35,985  
Gauthier & Connors  
225 Franklin Street, Suite 2300  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110  
Telephone: (617) 426-9180  
Extension: 110